

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

Angel James Moreno,

Petitioner,

v.

Charles L Ryan, et al.,

Respondents.

No. CV-15-01698-PHX-DLR

**ORDER**

Before the Court is Petitioner Angel James Moreno's Amended Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus and United States Magistrate Judge Michelle H. Burns' Report and Recommendation (R&R). (Docs. 9, 18.) The R&R recommends that the Court deny the Petition. (Doc. 18 at 14.) The Magistrate Judge advised the parties that they had fourteen days to file objections to the R&R and that failure to file timely objections could be considered a waiver of the right to obtain review of the R&R. (*Id.* at 14-15 (citing Fed. R. Civ. P. 72; *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003)).)

Petitioner did not file objections, which relieves the Court of its obligation to review the R&R. *See Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d at 1121; *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985) ("[Section 636(b)(1)] does not . . . require any review at all . . . of any issue that is not the subject of an objection."); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3) ("The district judge must determine de novo any part of the magistrate judge's disposition that has been properly objected to."). The Court has nonetheless reviewed the R&R and finds that it is well-

1 taken. The Court will accept the R&R and deny the Petition. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)  
2 (stating that the district court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the  
3 findings or recommendations made by the magistrate”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3) (“The  
4 district judge may accept, reject, or modify the recommended disposition; receive further  
5 evidence; or return the matter to the magistrate judge with instructions.”).


6 **IT IS ORDERED** that Magistrate Judge Burns’ R&R, (Doc. 18), is **ACCEPTED**.  
7 Petitioner’s Amended Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus, (Doc. 9), is **DENIED** and  
8 **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**.

9 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that a Certificate of Appealability and leave to  
10 proceed *in forma pauperis* on appeal are **DENIED** because the dismissal of the Petition is  
11 justified by a plain procedural bar and reasonable jurists would not find the ruling  
12 debatable, and because Petitioner has not made a substantial showing of the denial of a  
13 constitutional right.

14 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the Clerk of the Court shall terminate this  
15 case.

16 Dated this 27th day of December, 2016.

17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Douglas L. Rayes  
United States District Judge